



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,396	02/18/2004	Joel M. Walker	IDF 2648 (4000-16900)	1884
28003	7590	06/23/2010		
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER SHAAWAT, MUSSA A	
			ART UNIT 3627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/781,396	Applicant(s) WALKER, JOEL M.	
	Examiner MUSSA SHAAWAT	Art Unit 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-23 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-16, 19-22, 32-34, 38, 39, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 17, 18, 23, 35-37 and 40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 04/05/2010. Claims 1-13 and 24-31 have been cancelled. Claims 40-42 have been newly added. Claims 14-23 and 32-39 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 14-16, 21-22, 32-34, 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell et al., US PG Pub. No. (2003/0074313) referred to hereinafter as McConnell in view of Beckman US PG. Pub. No. (2002/0143674) referred to hereinafter as Beckman.

As per claim 14, McConnell teaches a method for performing a mediation process on invoice data, the method comprising: registering, with a mediation process manager stored in a computer readable storage media and executed by a processor, a plurality of data identifiers and a plurality of mediation processes in a reference table stored in a computer readable storage media, wherein each of the plurality of data identifiers is registered to correspond to at least one of the plurality of mediation processes, and wherein each of the plurality of mediation processes perform a different data processing function (see at least Pare 0018-0020);

retrieving, with a mediation transform unit stored in a computer readable media and executed by a processor, invoice data from one or more data sources stored in a computer readable storage media, the invoice data corresponds to one of the plurality of data identifiers (see at least Para 0016-0023);

identifying, with the mediation process manager, the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes to perform on the invoice data by determining that the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes are registered in the reference table to correspond with the one of the plurality of data identifiers that corresponds to the invoice data (see at least Para 0016-0021); and

performing the at least one of the plurality of mediation processes on the invoice data to generate a mediated output (see at least Para 0016-0023, 0054). Although McConnell teaches a mediated output; McConnell does not expressly teach wherein the mediated output is different from the invoice data. However Beckman does teaches consolidated the billing or invoice inputs from different vendors into a different output (see at least Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to incorporate the teachings of Beckman into the disclosure of McConnell in order to yield a business cost reduction for vendors.

As per claim 15, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein each data identifier identifies a data source and the corresponding mediation process relates to the mediation process to be performed on data from that data source (see at least Para 0016-023).

As per claim 16, McConnell teaches a The method of Claim 15, wherein the invoice data is billing data (see at least Para 0016).

As per claim 21, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the mediated output is further defined as a mediated invoice (see at least Para 0016-0023).

As per claim 22, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 14, wherein the invoices are further defined as telephone bills and wherein the mediated output is includes a portion of the call details from the telephone bill (see at least Para 0003).

As per claim 32, McConnell teaches method of Claim 17, wherein a special handling function controller performs the special handling function on the invoice data (see at least Abstract Claims, abstract Para 0018-0026).

As per claim 33, McConnell teaches method of Claim 32, wherein the special handling function controller invokes the special handling function based on information registered in the reference table (see at least Abstract Claims, abstract Para 0018-0026).

As per claim 34, McConnell teaches method of Claim 32, wherein the special handling function comprises manipulating data (see at least Abstract Claims, abstract Para 0018-0026).

As per claim 39, McConnell teaches e method of Claim 14, wherein the reference table is coupled to a user interface (see at least Abstract Claims, abstract Para 0018-0026).

As per claims 41-41, all of the limitations of claims 41-42 are similar to the limitations of claim 14 therefore they are rejected based on the same rationale; except

Art Unit: 3627

for repeating the process of claim 14 for a second and third invoice data from one or more sources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify McConnell in view of Beckman to include repeating the process of claim 14 for a second and third invoice data from one or more sources since McConnell in view of Beckman already teach implementing the process on at least one invoice in order to accommodate the mediation of more than one invoice to enhance customer satisfaction.

4. Claims 19-20 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of Beckman in further view of Official Notice.

As per claim 19 and 38, McConnell in view of Beckman do not expressly teach performing a data transformation process in accordance with a predetermined defining structure; wherein the predetermined defining structure is an Extensible Markup Language schema. The examiner takes Official Notice that performing a data transformation on a data to an XML format is old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of McConnell in view of Beckman to include performing a transformation of data into an XML format in order aid the sharing of information between systems especially via the internet.

As per claim 20, McConnell teaches a method of Claim 19 further comprising retrieving data directly from a data generation unit via a direct data access controller, wherein at least one of the special handling function and the workflow adjustment function is performed on the retrieved data (see at least Para 0016-0023 and figure 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. The limitations of claims 17-18, 23, 35-37 and 40 appear to be allowable if the applicant amends independent claim 14 to include all of the limitations of claims 17-18, 23, 35-37 and 40.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular applicant argues that McConnell does not disclose identifying from a plurality of mediating processes the appropriate mediating process to perform on data by identifying a data identifier associated with the data and determining the mediation process that is registered in the reference table that corresponds with the data identifier.

In response to A) the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. McConnell teaches a mediation device which identifies whether to charge the customer based on the call duration or the plurality of services provided, i.e. identifying from a plurality of mediating processes the appropriate mediating process to perform on data by identifying a data identifier associated with the data and determining the mediation process that is registered in the reference table that corresponds with the data identifier. Therefore McConnell still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

Re: Official Notice; The examiner notes, that the appellant failed to specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action dated 01/26/2009, and to state why the notice fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well known in the art,

Art Unit: 3627

therefore In view of the inadequate traversal, and in light of the requirements of 2144.03(c), ***the examiner notes that the well known in the art statements of the previous Office Action are considered to be admitted prior art.***

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-2945. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mussa A Shaawat
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
June 8, 2010

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627